1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Center for Disability Access Ray Ballister, Jr., Esq., SBN 111282 Mark Potter, Esq., SBN 166317 Phyl Grace, Esq., SBN 171771 Dennis Price, SBN 279082 Mail: PO Box 262490 San Diego, CA 92196-2490 Delivery: 9845 Erma Road, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92131 (858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax phylg@potterhandy.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs UNITED STATES I	
12	Chris Langer,	Case No. '14CV2499 W MDD
13	Plaintiff,	Complaint For Damages And Injunctive Relief For Violations
14	v.	Of American's With Disabilities
15 16 17 18	Fidel M. Montanez, in his individual and representative capacity as trustee of the Fidel M. Montanez Trust; Fidel's Little Mexico, Inc., a California Corporation; and Does 1-10,	Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act; California Disabled Persons Act; Negligence
19	Defendants.	
20		
21	Plaintiff Chris Langer complains of Defendants Fidel M. Montanez, in	
22	his individual and representative capacity as trustee of the Fidel M.	
23	Montanez Trust; Fidel's Little Mexico, Inc., a California Corporation; and	
24	Does 1-10 ("Defendants") and alleges as follows:	
25		
26	PARTIES:	
27	1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is a	
28	paraplegic who cannot walk and who uses a wheelchair for mobility. He has	

3

4

5

6 7

9

8

11 12

10

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

a specially equipped van with a ramp that deploys out of the passenger side of his van and he has a Disabled Person Parking Placard issued to him by the State of California.

- 2. Defendants are, or were at the time of the incidents, the real property owners, business operators, lessors and/or lessees for Fidel's Little Mexico restaurant ("Restaurant") located at or about 607 Valley Avenue, Solana Beach, California.
- 3. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

JURISDICTION & VENUE:

- 4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.
- 5. Pursuant to pendant jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act, and the California Disabled Persons Act, which acts expressly incorporate the Americans with Disabilities Act.
 - 6. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is

1 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action 2 is located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this 3 district.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

- 7. The Plaintiff went to the Restaurant in July of 2014, to eat.
- 8. The Restaurant is a facility open to the public, a place of public accommodation, and a business establishment.
- 9. Parking spaces are one of the facilities, privileges and advantages offered by defendants to their customers at the Restaurant.
- 10. Unfortunately, although parking spaces are one of the facilities available to patrons of the Restaurant, there are not enough handicapaccessible parking spaces in the parking lot serving the Restaurant. Even though there are about 65 parking spaces serving the Restaurant, there are just two parking spaces reserved for disabled persons. On the day of plaintiff's visit, both of these parking spaces were taken.
- 11. Additionally, the handicap parking stalls and access aisles are not level. Indeed, the slopes are greater than that allowed by law.
- 12. The plaintiff personally encountered these problems. This inaccessible condition denied the plaintiff full and equal access and caused him difficulty and frustration.
- 13. Plaintiff would like to return and patronize the Restaurant but will be deterred from visiting until the defendants cure the violations. Plaintiff lives in the county and visits this area of San Diego often. This Restaurant is conveniently located. Plaintiff would like to return and eat.
- 14. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable condition those features required to provide ready access to persons with disabilities.

information and belief, that there are other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See Doran v. 7-11, 506 F.3d 1191 (9th Cir. 2007) (holding that once a plaintiff encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

15. Given the obvious and blatant violations, the plaintiff alleges, on

16. Additionally, on information and belief, the plaintiff alleges that the failure to remove these barriers was intentional because: (1) these particular barriers are intuitive and obvious; (2) the defendants exercised control and dominion over the conditions at this location and, therefore, the lack of accessible facilities was not an "accident" because had the defendants intended any other configuration, they had the means and ability to make the change.

I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (On behalf of plaintiffs and against all defendants (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

- 17. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.
- 18. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part 36, Appendix "D."
- c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).
- 19. Any business that provides parking spaces must provide a sufficient number of handicap parking spaces. 1991 Standards § 4.1.2(5). 2010 Standards § 208. According to the 1991 Standards, if a parking lot has 65 spaces, it must have 3 accessible parking spaces. 1991 Standards § 4.1.2(5)(a). Under the 2010 Standards, a parking lot with 65 parking spaces must have 3 accessible spaces. 2010 Standards § 208.2.
- 20. Here, the lack of enough handicap-accessible parking spaces is a violation of the law.
- 21. Under the 1991 Standards, parking spaces and access aisles must be level with surface slopes not exceeding 1:50 (2%) in all directions. 1991

1 Standards § 4.6.2. 2 22. Here, the access aisle and parking spaces are not level and have slopes 3 that exceed 2%. Under the 2010 Standards, access aisles shall be at the same 4 level as the parking spaces they serve. Changes in level are not permitted. 5 2010 Standards § 502.4. 6 23. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working 7 condition those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be 8 readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 9 36.211(a). 10 24. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible parking was available 11 and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law. 12 13 II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (On behalf of plaintiffs and against all defendants) 14 (Cal Civ § 51-53) 15 16 25. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth 17 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this 18 complaint. 19 26. Because the defendants violated the plaintiffs' rights under the ADA, 20 they also violated the Unruh Civil Rights Act and are liable for damages. (Civ. Code § 51(f), 52(a).) 21 22 27. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in 23 difficulty, discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiffs, the defendants are 24 also each responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 25 55.56(a)-(c).) 26 27

28

PRAYER: Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief as follows: 1. For injunctive relief, compelling defendants to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the Plaintiffs are not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all. 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act and/or the California Disabled Persons Act which damages provide for actual damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000. Note: a plaintiff cannot recover under both acts, simultaneously, and an election will be made prior to or at trial. 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52 and 54.3. Dated: August 11, 2014 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS By: Mark Potter, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff